SITE SCREENING ASSESSMENT

Prepared by: Joseph Kaslowski
California Department of Toxic Substances Control
Cooperative Agreement Number: V99925205-0
DTSC Fiscal Year: 04 - 05

Prepared for:
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region 9
States, Planning, and Assessment Office
San Francisco, California

Date: April 11, 2006

Site Name: Caspian, Inc. EPA ID Number: CAD053851366 City: San Diego County: San Diego

DTSC Regional Office: Cypress

	EXECU	TIVE SU	JN	MMARY	_			
Site Name:	Caspian, Inc							
EPA ID Number:	CAD053851366							
	<u>Findings an</u>	d Reco	<u>m</u>	mendatio	<u>n:</u>			
FINDINGS: (new s	sites only)							
SITE IS CERCLA	ELIGIBLE			Yes		No		
- refer to section 1 3								
L .	MERGENCY RESPONS	SE [Yes	\boxtimes	No		
- refer to section 1 4								
	ATORY AGENCY INVO	LVED [Federal		State		Local
- refer to section 3.0								N/A
OVERALL SITE P	RIORITY LEVEL			High	\boxtimes	Medium		Low
HAZARD FACTO	R VALUE			High		Medium		Low
VULNERABILITY	FACTOR VALUE]	High	\boxtimes	Medium		Low
OTHER INFLUEN	CING FACTORS			High	\boxtimes	Medium		Low
- refer to section 4.0								
RECOMMENDATI								
REMEDIATION LE	AD: STATE OR FEDER	RAL: L	_ _	State	$ \boxtimes $	Federal		Local
FORWARD TO TR	RIAGE:	\boxtimes		Yes		No		Hold
DTSC Screener:	Signature	and Co	n	Currence Joseph Kasic	- wski		11 / 20 (MM/DD	006 YYYY)
DTSC Approval:	Jacob Maler Signature		•	Greg Holm Type Name		Date:	(Z <i> Q</i> (MM/DD/	C YYYY)
EPA Concurrence:	Signature			Matt Mitgua Type Name	!		(MM/DD/	
Note: Executive Summary pa ourpose of a grant deliverable	ge to be copied to originator once E	PA Concurren	ice	block is signed. E	-PA co	ncurrence approve	es screer	1 for
EPA only:				for CERCLA. Fur		sessment is recor	nmended	i.
Date sent to DTSC:						PL Status = N PL Status = O for a	all option	s below

Non-NPL Status = Not a Valid Site

Non-NPL Status = Not a Valid Site - RCRA Lead

Non-NPL Status = Not a Valid Site - NRC Lead Non-NPL Status = Not a Valid Site - State Lead

Comments:

Next Triage Meeting (MM/DD/YY):

US EPA / CA DTSC COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT SITE SCREENING ASSESSMENT Table of Contents

1.0	General Instructions 1.1 Site Information 1.2 Core Locational Information 1.3 CERCLA Eligibility Attachment A: Site Screening Assessment Contact Log Attachment B: Site Evaluation Map and Backup 1.4 Removal Assessment Eligibility (non-time critical)
2.0	Technical Information 2 1 Operational History 2 2 Contaminants 2 3 Has a release as defined in CERCLA Section 101(22) occurred? 2 4 Pathway(s) of contaminant migration 2 5 Sampling History 2 6 Additional Information Attachment C: Site Screening Assessment Observation Record Attachment D: Site Type – Primary/Secondary Activity Form Attachment E: Sampling Event Summary Table
3.0	Regulatory and Enforcement History 3.1 Regulatory Agencies: Federal 3.2 Regulatory Agencies: State, State Deferral 3.3 Regulatory Agencies: Local 3.4 PRP Viability Attachment F: Enforcement and Regulatory Reference Documentation
4.0	Site Prioritization Worksheet 4 1 Hazards Identification 4 2 Vulnerability Analysis 4 3 Other Influencing Factors 4 4 Overall Ranking of Site
Attach	ment A – Site Screening Assessment Contact Report
Attach	ment B – Site Evaluation Map and Site Report (EPA GIS Center) Cover Page
Attach	ment C – Site Screening Observation Record
Attach	ment D – Site Type – Primary/Secondary Activity Form
Attach	ment E – Site Screening Assessment Sampling Event Summary Table & Analytical Results
Attachi	ment F – Enforcement and Regulatory Agency Reference Documentation Cover Page

1.0 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Complete this section electronically using readily available information and contact information from appropriate individuals. A <u>Site Screening Assessment Contact Log</u> (Attachment A) should be used to document information gained through correspondence, interviews, file reviews and telephone calls. Add extra pages if necessary.

1.1 Origin of Site Under Assessment: Pick one

	Required Information for submittal to EPA
	Fill out entire SSA Form
Proje	ct
? □	Sections 1 and 3 minimum
	Fill out entire SSA Form
'	
	, San Diego , California
ID nur	mber 13280019
	,
	
·	
÷: <u>-1</u>	17.125657
	Proje

Note: Latitude and Longitude coordinates along with MAD code will be generated by the USEPA GIS Center along with an accompanying "<u>Site Evaluation Map and Site Report</u> (Attachment B) of this document Latitude and Longitude coordinate and accompanying Site Evaluation Maps should be requested via email to the EPA Document Control Officer, Joan Simmons.

1.3 CERCLA Eligibility

for Cl	plete the following checklist. If Ayes@ is marked, the site may not be eligible ERCLA assessment without further justification. Please explain in the ion / Rationale section below.	YES	NO
1.	Does the site already appear in CERCLIS?		
2	Is the release from products that are part of the structure of, and result in exposure within, residential buildings or businesses or community structures?		
3.	Does the site consist of a release of a naturally occurring substance in its unaltered form, or altered solely through naturally occurring processes or phenomena, from a location where it is naturally found?		
4	Is the release into a public or private drinking water supply due to deterioration of the system through ordinary use?		\boxtimes
5.	Is some other program actively involved with the site (i e , another Federal, State, or Tribal program)?		\boxtimes
6.	Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site regulated under a statutory exclusion (i.e., petroleum, natural gas, natural gas liquids, synthetic gas usable for fuel, normal application of fertilizer, release located in a workplace, naturally occurring, or regulated by the NRC, UMTRCA, or OSHA)?		
7.	Are the hazardous substances potentially released at the site excluded by policy considerations (e.g., deferral to RCRA Corrective Action)?		
8	Is there sufficient documentation that clearly demonstrates that there is no potential for a release that could cause adverse environmental or human health impacts (e.g., comprehensive remedial investigation equivalent data showing no release above ARARs, completed removal action, documentation showing that no hazardous substance releases have occurred, EPA approved risk assessment completed)?		
9	Part of a NPL-Site?		
	ly explain all "yes" answers in "Decision/Rationale" section below. Use numb mber Explanation of "yes" answer: Yes No	er reference.	
SITE	IS CERCLA ELIGIBLE		
Note:	This recommendation should be included on Executive Summary Page		

1.4 Removal Assessment Eligibility

Use the following eligibility criteria to determine if the site should be referred for emergency response. If the answer to any question is yes, get the site may be eligible for referral emergency response. If a question cannot be answered, explain why in the Comments section below

1.	Is there actual or potential exposure tanimals, or the food chain from hazar pollutants, or contaminants?			☐ Yes	⊠ No
2.	Is there actual or potential contamina sensitive ecosystems?	tion of drinking supplies or		☐ Yes	⊠ No
3.	Are hazardous substances, pollutants drums, barrels, tanks, or other bulk st may pose a threat of release?			☐ Yes	⊠ No
4	Are there high levels of hazardous su contaminants are soils largely at or ne migrate and affect populations or the	ear the surface, which may		☐ Yes	⊠ No
5.	Could weather conditions cause haza pollutants, or contaminants to migrate			☐ Yes	⊠ No
6.	Is there a threat of fire or explosion?			☐ Yes	⊠ No
7	Are there appropriate Federal or State respond to the release or potential release			⊠ Yes	☐ No
8	Are there other situations or factors w public health, welfare, or the environm			☐ Yes	⊠ No
9	For the situation where there appears groundwater contamination problem, i source which can be removed?			☐Yes	⊠ No
Please	explain all "yes" answer(s), noting ques	stion number (character ma	ax = 400, attach add	itional page i	f
necess					
	San Diego County Department of Envould be capable of providing assistant				ams
			·		
		Yes	No		
	o Emergency Response				
Note: Ti	nis recommendation should be included	d on Executive Summarv F	'age		

2.0 TECHNICAL INFORMATION

This section contains information about site's operational history and environmental sampling. Complete the following section by filling in the blanks or checking the appropriate boxes. If a question cannot be answered, explain why. If a drive-by is performed, complete the <u>Site Screening Assessment Observation Record</u> (Attachment C). A <u>Site Type — Primary/Secondary Activity Form</u> (Attachment D) focused on past or present operations of health or environmental concern should also be filled out.

2.1 Operational History

Elkhorn Ranch, Inc. is the current owner of the site since 2003 Stu Segall Productions is a current operator since 1998 Companying approximate in 2005	
Caspian, Inc ceased operations in 2005	
1b Are hazardous substances presently on site?	
2a. List historic site owner(s) and operator(s). [Include dates of ownership, character max = 300]: NASA conducted explosive forming and other (unknown) processes. Teledyne Ryan conducted explosive forming and chemical milling. Straza and Plessy are both companies that conducted chemical milling at the site. The dates of operation are unknown. Caspian, Inc. was an operator from 1965 to 2005.	÷
2b. Were hazardous substances present on site in the past?	-).

Additional comments (Character max = 400):

This has been a chemical milling facility since 1965. The site was also an aerospace application station. There have been Tiered Permitting activities at this site such as: generation of alkaline solutions, metal sludge, various solvents, contaminated soils from site clean up, liquids with hex-chromium and acidic liquids with metals. Some information was provided in the information request answered by Mr. Cyrus Jaffari, the President of Caspian, Inc. There is also information on DTSC's Hazardous Waste Tracking System for Caspian, Inc. as a RCRA generator.

2.2 Contaminant(s):

List any hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants that have been identified at the site and indicate whether they have been quantified (e.g., by sampling)

		Suspected	Identified	Quantified	Comments
	Arsenic				
	Asbestos				
	Beryllium				
	Cadmium				
	Carbon tetrachloride	. 🔲			
	Chloroform				
\boxtimes	Chromium (+3 or +6)	\boxtimes			See Included Report
\boxtimes	Copper	\boxtimes			See Included Report
	Cyanide				
	Dichloroethene,1,1-				
	Dioxin				
	Ethyl benzene				
	Lead				
	Mercury				
	Methylene chloride				
	Nickel				
	P-Dichlorobenzene				
	Pentachlorophenol				
	Perchlorate				
	Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)				
	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)				
\boxtimes	Tetrachloroethene	П		\boxtimes	See Included Report
	Toluene				oee included Neport
	Trichloroethylene				
	Vinyl chloride				
	Xylene				
	Zinc			\boxtimes	See Included Report
	Other chemicals (Specify):				oce moluded report
ш	other enemicals (openity).				
		<u> </u>			
П	Pesticides (Specify):				
	(2,2,3,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,7,				
			<u></u>		
				لسيسا	

2.3 Has a release as de	efined in CERCLA	Section 101(22) occurred?	
	Yes	spected] No	
etc.) Character max = 300:	is a PCE release in the	vicinity of the ma	s, landfill, surface impoundment, waste pile naskant below-grade processing structures ses and contamination	,
2.4 Pathway(s) of conta	minant migration:			
⊠ Air	⊠ Groundwater	Surface W	Vater ⊠ Soil	
Briefly describe any identified	pathway (Character ma	x = 400):		
There are records of PCE co results confirmed PCE in the as a pathway, but according	ntamination along with t soil, which is also a pat to available information,	he possibility of hway for the chr the groundwate	chromium contamination. Sampling romium. Groundwater could be considered er is very deep at the site. Since soil It is unlikely surface water is a pathway	
2.5 Sampling History1. Has sampling been conduction	cted? ⊠ Yes □ No			
2. If environmental sampling	has been conducted, us		Event Summary Table (Attachment E) to benchmark by "bolding" the number	
2.6 Additional Informati	ion			
Use this space to present addidecisions. (Character max = 4		ay be used to su	upport site screening assessment	
sampling data, however, the r	eport is vague and there	e is no informatio	at contains some correspondence and on available as to who compiled it or when there is one letter dated in 1997.	

3.0 REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

Provide information regarding past and present regulatory and enforcement activity associated with the site Citations and reference documentation should be included for *initiation*, *status*, *and certification* documents used for substantiating site status. Web links may be used when accompanying a short narrative regarding what the document in the link states about the site. Sections 3.1 through 3.4 are limited of 1800 characters (approximately two paragraphs). Responses requiring more space should be included as a reference to this report and identified below with the statement "See Attachment F".

	□ C+++	ivity (OCA sites ("G4 sites"))	
Primary Regulatory Agency Involved		☐ Local ☐ None	
Note: This recommendation should be included on	Executive Sun	nmary Page	
3.1 Regulatory Agencies: Federal			
There is no evidence of active involvement from a	a Federal agen	су	
3.2 Regulatory Agencies: State			
There is no evidence of active involvement from a as concurring with the San Diego Department of E	State agency	The RWQCB is mentioned in correspondent to the RWQCB is mentioned in correspondent to the control of the RWQCB is mentioned in correspondent.	ondence
to have taken place by the DEHS.	.nvii Oinnentai 1	realiti Services, but the active regulation	ni secilis
			-
			·

3.3 Regulatory Agencies: Local	
The County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health Services Hazardous Materials Manageme Division appears to be the main agency involved at this site. The HMMD permitted closure in place of the chemical milling underground storage tanks in September 1993. There is a letter for the removal of the materials tank in May 1996. The letters are contained in the included report in "Attachment C".	!
3.4 PRP Viability According the California Secretary of State, Caspian, Inc is still a viable company	

4.0 SITE PRIORITIZATION WORKSHEET

The following risk-based criteria should be used as a guideline to assist in the prioritization of pre-CERCLIS and CERCLIS sites. These guidelines can be used in various stages of assessment. When interpreting the information provided below, one should understand that conservative assumptions were made where information is lacking and the risk value is subjective.

Site screeners should complete this form by using the categories as guidelines. The "Comments" section should be used to document assumptions made, data sources, or other information pertinent to determining risk prioritization.

4.1 Hazards Identification

Complete the sections below for the suspected contaminants of *greatest* concern. Use SCDMs as a reference for assigning hazardous substance risk category. Assign a Hazard Factor for each hazardous substance evaluated and then assign an Overall Hazard Factor Value combining the separate Hazard Factors. If only one hazardous substance is evaluated, the Overall Hazard Factor Value will be the same as the Hazard Factor for A. The individual conducting the Site screening assessment has the option of evaluating as many substances as deemed necessary so long as the contaminants of greatest concern and concentration are addressed first.

HAZADDOUG (NIDO	FANOT A. T.I	- 4 1-	(DOE)	~ 	
HAZARDOUS :	งบธอ	TANCE A: Tetrachloro	petnyle	ne (PCE)		TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF
Estimate the ris	k asso	ciated with the hazard	prope	rties for this hazardous substar	nce	
Hazard	T	HIGH	1	MEDIUM	<u> </u>	LOW
Property		nign		MEDION		LOVA
Quantity	!	>10,000 lbs; or 5 mil. gals; or 25,000 yds ³		10,000 lbs and >100 lbs; or <5 mil. gals and >50,000 gals; or <25,000 yds ³ and >250 yds ³		<100 lbs. or 50,000 gals or 250 yds³
Toxicity	>	10,000	⊠ <	10,000 and >100	□ <	<100
Mobility	⊠ 1			1 and >0 001	<	0.001
Bioavailability	>	1,000	⊠ <	1,000 and >10	☐ <	:10
Concentration (if known)	mg/k High mg/k	est sample = <u>190</u>	Highe	ear benchmark = est sample = ear benchmark = est sample =	High	ow relative to benchmark est sample = ow relative to benchmark est sample =
Level of Containment	⊠ N	one	. —	artial =	☐ F Type	ull ==
Hazard Factor for A	\boxtimes	HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW

Comments regarding Substance A should be included in "Comments" section at the end of this section.

Hazard Property		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW	
Quantity	5 m	0,000 lbs; or il. gals; or 000 yds ³	<	<10,000 lbs and >100 lbs; or <5 mil gals and >50,000 gals; or <25,000 yds³ and >250 yds³		100 ibs. or 50,000 gals or 250 yds³	
Toxicity	>10),000	<1	0,000 and >100	⊠ <1	100	
Viobility	1 1	,	□ <1	and >0.001	☑ <0.001		
Bioavailability	>1,	☐ >1,000				□ <10	
Concentration (if known)	sample = >benchmark = sample =		sampl	☐ near benchmark = sample = ☐ near benchmark = sample =		 ☑ low relative to benchmark Highest sample = 59.6 ☐ low relative to benchmark Highest sample = 	
evel of Containment	⊠ Non	Э	☐ Par Type=	tial	☐ Ful Type=		
lazard Factor or B		HIGH		MEDIUM		LOW	
_	_	bstance B shou		ided in "Comments" sectio	n at the	end of this section	
	\square	HIGH	□ KAI	EDIUM LOW	J		

COMMENTS SUPPORTING HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES EVALUATED ABOVE:

Haz. Substance	Hazard Property and Comment (Character max = 300)
Tetrachloroethylene (PCE)	Information obtained from included report from an unknown author prepared at an unknown time. PCE was detected in the vicinity of the maskant dip tank. Two samples taken were relatively high at 190 and 62 mg/kg. The maskant tank was removed, but it does not appear that any remediation was done regarding the PCE. The quantity of contamination is unknown. The maskant tank was roughly 15,000 gallons, but was operated for 40 years or more.
Total Chromium	Chromium is suspected as a contaminant; however, it does not seem that Chromium was investigated to a reasonable extent. The data listed above is for Chromium +3. There is inadequate characterization of hexavalent Chromium, which is also a suspected contaminant.

4.2 Vulnerability Analysis

Assign a risk category to each of the following vulnerability factors Assign an Overall Vulnerability Factor Value for the site based on the dominant vulnerability risk categories

	Vulnerability Factor	High	Medium	Low
1.	Environmental Setting - Land use within 0 5 miles of the site	Residential	Agricultural/ Commercial	☑ Industrial
2	Sensitive Populations - Children, the elderly, or groups with poor health live:	☐ Within 0 25 miles of site		More than 0 25 miles from site
3.	Population Density - Evaluate within 0 5 miles	☐ Dense		☐ Sparse
4.	Groundwater Use - Wells used for drink- ing water are located:	Within 0.5 miles of the site	0.5 to 2 miles from site	More than 2 miles from site
5	Groundwater Contamination - Evaluate groundwater contamination within 2 miles of the site	⊠ Known	Possible	☐ Not likely
6.	Surface Water Location - Distance to nearest surface water body If used for drinking water or known to be contami- nated, bump to next higher risk category	☐Within 0.5 miles of the Site	0.5 to 2 miles from site	More than 2 miles from site
7	Sensitive Habitats - Distance to nearest sensitive habitat. If known or projected contamination within habitat, bump to next higher risk category.	☐ Within 0.5 miles of the site	0 5 to 2 miles from site	More than 2 miles from site
8	Soil/Air Contamination - Evaluate the potential for exposure to individuals from contaminated soil or air releases.	Documented or probable exposure	Potential for exposure	Exposure not likely
9.	Sampling Data Confidence - Evaluate the quality of any data available for the site	☐ No oversight; no QA/QC; no data	Regulatory oversight; EPA methods; partial or unknown QA/QC	Regulatory oversight; EPA methods; QA/QC validation
RAI	L VULNERABILITY FACTOR VALU	IF (Pick one only)	· ·	

OVE

HIGH	\square	MEDIUM	☐ LOW
	Δ	MEDIOM	

COMMENTS SUPPORTING VULNERABILITY FACTOR EVALUATED ABOVE:

Vulnerabity Factor #	Comments (Character max = 300)
8	It does not appear there is sufficient evidence that the site has been fully investigated and characterized.
9	The data available is minimal, not well documented and provided by the contractor for Caspian, Inc.

4.3 Other Influencing Factors Matrix

Assign a high, medium, or low priority category to each of the following factors and then use these factors to help make preliminary recommendations in Section 5. A high priority influence may indicate that a Preliminary Assessment should be conducted as a high priority without regard to other screening factors. A low priority influence given for removal, regulatory, and Brownfields activities must be substantiated with citations to "initiation", "remediation", and "certification" documentation.

	Other Influences	High		Medium		Low		
1	Site remedial/ removal history	None		Some		All wastes remove	ed	
2	Regulatory involvement	☐ No involvement		Somewhat involved		Other agency curr active	rently	
4	Brownfields/Redevelopment	Possible candidate				Not a likely candid	date	
3.	Environmental justice	Site is in low income/minority neighborhood				Site is not in low in or minority neighborhood	ncome	
5.	Political attention	☐ Very visible/vocal		Some involvement		None	·	
6.	Public attention	☐ Very visible/vocal		Some involvement	\boxtimes	None		
7.	Remedial Costs	∠ Likely very expensive or difficult				Easy and relatively cheap	у	
ОТ	HER INFLUENCING FACT	ORS CATEGORY (Pick	one only):				
	☐ HIGH	⊠ MEDIU	M	☐ LO\	V			
	er Influence Citation letter reference	(Character max = 300)						
Ran	4.4 Overall Ranking of Site Risk Rankings below reflect the professional judgement of the person conducting the Site Screening							
	essment (SSA). Information us document.	sed to draw such cond	iusio	ilis is iouna in i	uie i	Jody and attachmen	its oi	
HA	ZARD FACTOR VALUE (4.1)]	\boxtimes	HIGH		MEDIUM I	LOW	
VU	LNERABILITY FACTOR VALUE	(4 2)		HIGH	\boxtimes	MEDIUM I	LOW	
OT	HER INFLUENCING FACTORS	(4 3)		HIGH [\boxtimes	MEDIUM [] [_OW	
OV	ERALL SITE PRIORITY LEVEL			HIGH [\boxtimes	MEDIUM L	LOW	

Note: This recommendation should be included on Executive Summary Page

Attachment A

SITE SCREENING ASSESSMENT CONTACT REPORT

Site Name: Caspian, Inc. Site Screener: Teresa Hom/Joseph Kaslowski

Contact Name	Affiliation	Telephone Number	Date	Discussion
Rick Remias	Caspian – Mgr.	619-208-3145	2005	Met Rick at the site
Robert La Salle	CFO – Stu Segall	858-974-8988	11/07 2005	He provided information about the owner.
Greg Prior	Operations – Stu Segall	619-719-7706	11/07 2005	He provided operations information and site status Caspian has been removing remnants of operations from the site
Cyrus Jaffari	President – Caspian	619-871-3110	04/18 2005	Information request letter sent.
John Anderson	RWQCB - SD	858-467-2975	06/10 2005	File request – no information, referred DTSC to DEH.
George McCandless	SD DEH – Hazmat	619-338-2259	06/29 2005	Provided information on case status referred DTSC to Haz Waste Program for failed integrity test status
Bob Giesick	SD DEH – Planning and Land Use	858-296-0694	07/18 2005	Informed DTSC there are no drinking wells in the area
Brian Ernados	DHS – Drinking Water Program	619-525-4497	07/21 2005	Informed DTSC the drinking water wells are >2 mi from the site
			2	
5			ļ	
9			11.0	

Attachment B

SITE EVALUATION MAP AND BACKUP COVER PAGE

Attachment C

SITE SCREENING OBSERVATION RECORD

Site Name: Caspian, Inc. EPA ID Number: CAD053851366		Site Screener: Teresa Hom Date: June 7, 2005
1. Status:	Active X Inactive	Different Company X
2. Setting:	Residential	Agricultural Unpaved Unrestricted access
	Topography: relatively flat	
3. Visibility: good		
4. Waste Descrip Containment: Pond	tion:	Ditch
Drums <u>X</u>	Tanks	Buckets
Trash can <u>X</u> Piles	Dumpster <u>X</u> Scattered	Sacks
1 IIC3	ocallereu	Other
Stored On:	Aenhalt	Dallata
	Concrete X	Other
vvaste i ype:	Garbane X	Liquid
Solid	Sludge	Gas
Bare Ground Gravel Waste Type: Inert Solid	Concrete <u>X</u> Garbage <u>X</u> Sludge	Other Liquid Gas
		:: The site is currently used as a filming studio and the
and to only associ	atou with such activities.	-

		environments or ecosystems: ts located within the immediate vicinity.
Proximity to	residences schools day c	are facilities hospitals nursing homes etc.
		are facilities, hospitals, nursing homes, etc.: y. Clairemont Villa Adult Day is ½ mile away.

7.	7. Distance to food processing/packaging or agricultural production: <u>Unknown</u>					
8.	Additional Information:					
-						
9. SI	ketch a diagram of the facility with relevant features and labels.					

	·
	:
	:
	!
	÷ ·
	•
	·
	:
	×
	1

Attachment D

SITE TYPE - PRIMARY/SECONDARY ACTIVITY FORM

	Fe	d Fac Indicator:	\boxtimes	Not	A Federal Facility 🔲 Status Undetermined			
	RC	RA Status: Generator	TSDF		☐ Transporter ☐ Not listed in RCRIS			
	1	SITE TYPES (Designate one dominant primary cathat apply) Site type designations for both primare environmental consequence.						
P	S	Manufacturing/Processing/Maintenance	P	S	Other			
С	S	(Subcategory)	<u> </u>	S				
	\times	Chemicals and allied products] \square		Agricultural			
		Coal gasification			Contaminated sediment site with no identifiable source			
		Coke production			Dust control			
		Electric power generation and distribution			Ground water plume site with no identifiable source			
		Electronic/electrical equipment	j 🖺		Military/other ordinance			
		Fabrics/textiles			Product storage/distribution			
Ш	Ш	Lumber and wood products/pulp and paper] [Ш	Research, development, and testing facility			
		Lumber and wood products/wood			Retail/commercial			
		preserving/treatment	-	فينعط				
\boxtimes		Metal fabrication/finishing/coating and allied industries			Spill or other one time event			
		Oil and gas			Transportation (e.g. railroad yards, airports, barge docking site			
		Ordnance production			Treatment works/septic tanks/other sewage treatment			
		Plastics and rubber products	7					
		Primary metals/minerals processing] P	S	Mining			
		Radioactive products) C	S	(Subcategory)			
		Tanneries			Coal			
		Trucks/ships/trains/aircraft and related components			Metals			
					Non-metals minerals			
Ρ	S	Waste Management] 🗍		Oil and gas			
P C	S	(Subcategory)						
		Radioactive waste treatment, storage, disposal	Р	S	Recycling			
		Municipal solid waste landfill	С	S	(Subcategory)			
		Mine tailings disposal			Automobiles/tires			
		Industrial waste landfill			Batteries/scrap metals/secondary smelting/precious metal recovery			
		Industrial waste facility (non generator)			Chemicals/chemicals waste (e.g. solvent recovery)			
		Illegal disposal/open dump			Drums/tanks			
Ī		Co-disposal landfill (municipal and industrial)			Waste/used oil			
	SITE TYPES (Designate one dominant primary category (PC). Designate all secondary subcategories (SS)							

that apply.)

•		

Attachment F

ENFORCEMENT AND REGULATORY AGENCY REFERENCE DOCUMENTATION COVER PAGE